

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Examiner's objections, rejections and comments in the Final Office Action of August 30, 2005 and have prepared the following response.

Claims 1—8 remain pending in this application. By this paper, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 6 for clarity. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, in Figures 1 through 5, and on pages 1-2, paragraph [0004] of the specification.

From the Final Office Action dated August 30, 2005, claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Welch (U.S. Patent No. 2,776,362, hereinafter "Welch") in view of either Seele (U.S. Patent No. 2,590,896, hereinafter "Seele") or Marlsbury et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,751,852, hereinafter "Marlsbury"). Each of the rejections is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration is requested in view of the following comments.

In rejecting claims 1-8, the Examiner points out that certain features upon which Applicants rely (i.e., "the use of a plurality of keyhole-type apertures engaging the fasteners to quickly and removably secure an actuator to a resistance welding machine without the necessity of removing the fasteners") are not recited in the rejected claims. While Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of Applicants claims, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 6 for purposes of clarity and believes that such amendments correct the Examiner's concern.


Second, the Examiner has characterized Applicants invention and the cited prior art as all related to the broad concept of removably securing one object to another. Applicant takes issue with Examiner's characterization of Applicants claimed invention as concerning solely the concept of alignment and securing/locking one object to another. First, Applicant does not

dispute the fact that keyhole-type apertures were known in unrelated prior art fields as a method of aligning and securing/locking one object to another. However, the Examiner has failed to address the fact that the prior art lacks any suggestion for a quick releasing coupling mechanism for use with a welding gun, let alone the use of keyhole-type apertures to engage the fasteners as claimed by the Applicants. For example, Welch discloses removably securing an actuator to a resistance welding machine through the use of fasteners which must all be removed prior to removing the actuator from the resistance welding machine. Welch is otherwise silent. While Seele and Marlsbury disclose the use of keyhole-type apertures, this prior art still does not acknowledge that such an arrangement would be used in conjunction with a welding gun as claimed by Applicants.

From the foregoing, Applicants submit that the remaining claims in this application are now in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all previously outstanding rejections. If a telephone conference would expedite allowance or resolve any further questions, such a conference with the undersigned is invited at the convenience of the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10/28/05

By: 
Ralph E. Smith, Reg. No. 35,474
CIMS 483-02-19
DaimlerChrysler Intellectual Capital Company LLC
DaimlerChrysler Technology Center
800 Chrysler Drive
Auburn Hills, MI 48326-2757
248-944-6519

Attorney for Applicants